

JEREMY CREEK, S. C.

---

LETTER

FROM

THE SECRETARY OF WAR,

TRANSMITTING,

WITH A LETTER FROM THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, REPORTS ON PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF JEREMY CREEK, S. C., FROM MORRISONS WHARF TO MORRISONS BRIDGE, WITH A VIEW TO PROVIDING A DEPTH OF FOUR FEET AND A WIDTH OF SIXTY FEET.

---

JANUARY 27, 1914.—Referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

---

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
*Washington, January 26, 1914.*

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated 24th instant, together with copies of reports from Maj. G. P. Howell, Corps of Engineers, dated April 16 and December 4, 1913, with map, on preliminary examination and survey, respectively, of Jeremy Creek, S. C., made by him in compliance with the provisions of the river and harbor act approved March 4, 1913.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,  
*Secretary of War.*

---

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
*Washington, January 24, 1914.*

From: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

To: The Secretary of War.

Subject: Preliminary examination and survey of Jeremy Creek, S. C.

1. There are submitted herewith, for transmission to Congress, reports dated April 16 and December 4, 1913, with map, by Maj. G. P.



Howell, Corps of Engineers, on preliminary examination and survey, respectively, authorized by the following item contained in the river and harbor act approved March 4, 1913:

Jeremy Creek, S. C., from Morrisons Wharf to Morrisons Bridge, with a view to providing a depth of four feet and a width of sixty feet.

2. The improvement of the waterway between Charleston Harbor and Alligator Creek was authorized by the river and harbor act approved June 13, 1902, under a project providing for a channel 4 feet deep at mean low water and 60 feet bottom width between Charleston Harbor and a point opposite McClellanville. In 1907 this project was modified to provide for a branch channel in Jeremy Creek up to Morrisons Landing in McClellanville. The improvement now desired is an extension of this branch channel from Morrisons Landing to Morrisons Bridge, and in the event of this work being undertaken by the United States, local interests have agreed to subscribe \$805 and to provide a suitable public wharf. The district officer is of opinion that the full extension desired is not advisable at this time, but he believes that it is advisable to extend the channel as far as the lower canning factory, where a better site for a wharf exists than at the upper factory. The cost of such channel extension 4 feet deep and 60 feet wide, with a suitable turning basin, is estimated at \$10,000. Improvement to this extent is recommended by the district officer, provided local interests will donate a site and build a suitable wharf for public use.

3. These reports have been referred, as required by law, to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and attention is invited to its report herewith, dated January 13, 1914. The board is of opinion that it is advisable for the United States to undertake the improvement recommended by the district officer, provided, however, that local interests shall contribute \$5,000 to the work and shall provide a public wharf which in the opinion of the Secretary of War will be suitable for the accommodation of the boats running to McClellanville.

4. After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports, I concur in general with the views of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and therefore report that the further improvement by the United States of Jeremy Creek, S. C., is deemed advisable as an extension or modification of the existing project for improving the waterway from Charleston Harbor to McClellanville, so far as to extend the branch channel from Morrisons Landing to a suitable landing in the vicinity of the lower canning factory, 4 feet deep at mean low water and 60 feet bottom width, at an estimated cost of \$10,000 for first construction and \$1,000 annually for maintenance, under the conditions of local cooperation recommended by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and specified above. The amount estimated for expenditure by the United States on first construction, \$5,000, should be provided in one appropriation.

EDW. BURR,  
*Colonel, Corps of Engineers,  
Acting Chief of Engineers.*



REPORT OF THE BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS  
ON SURVEY.

[Third indorsement.]

BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS,  
*January 13, 1914.*

To the CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY:

1. This is a report of preliminary examination and survey of Jeremy Creek, S. C., from Morrisons Wharf to Morrisons Bridge, with a view to providing a depth of 4 feet and a width of 60 feet.

2. The project for the improvement of the inland waterways between Charleston, S. C., and Alligator Creek, opposite McClellanville, was modified by the act of March 2, 1907, so as to provide for a branch channel to Morrisons Landing in McClellanville, on Jeremy Creek. The improvement now desired is an extension of the channel up Jeremy Creek to Morrisons Bridge, a distance of about 1 mile.

3. The principal interests concerned are two oyster-canning factories, now under one management, and one logging concern located between said bridge and Morrisons Wharf. Above the present project the creek is practically dry at low water and boats have to wait on the tide, which has a height of about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  feet.

4. A survey having been made, the district officer reports that an extension of the channel up to Morrisons Bridge, 60 feet bottom width and 4 feet deep at mean low water, widened to 100 feet in front of the upper canning factory, and with a turning basin just below the bridge, will cost \$25,000 and \$1,500 annually for maintenance. Local interests propose to cooperate by furnishing a public wharf and a contribution of \$805 toward the prosecution of the work. This contribution, however, is made contingent on the extension of the channel up to the tramroad just below the bridge.

5. In addition to the advantages to be derived from the proposed channel by affording suitable navigation to the canning factories, it will afford an opportunity for the location of an additional wharf, which appears impracticable along the present improved channel below Morrisons Landing. Such a wharf appears to be needed, as under existing conditions the Morrison wharf does not offer adequate facilities.

6. The district officer is of opinion that it is not advisable to extend the channel up to Morrisons Bridge, but he believes that an additional landing should be provided for the McClellanville boats, and he favors the extension of the channel for this purpose up to a suitable site in the vicinity of the lower canning factory. To provide the channel to this point it is estimated would cost \$10,000 and \$1,000 annually for maintenance. The district officer believes that no work could be done by the General Government until a site for a public wharf has been donated and a suitable wharf actually built thereon.

7. From the information contained herein and obtained through a hearing given at the office of the board July 1, 1913, it appears that the present wharfage facilities at the town of McClellanville are inadequate to meet the needs of commerce, and it is claimed that it is impracticable to locate another wharf on the present improved channel. The extension of the channel up to the lower oyster factory, as proposed by the district officer, would reach a suitable site for a public wharf,



and it does not seem necessary to go beyond that point. To this extent the improvement appears advisable under proper conditions of cooperation. The United States has already expended a considerable sum to provide the existing channel and as the proposed extension is mainly required to afford additional terminal facilities, the benefits of which would accrue largely to local interests, the board is of opinion that these interests should contribute one-half the cost of the additional channel besides providing the public wharf as recommended by the district officer.

8. The board therefore recommends a modification of the existing project as proposed by the district officer, so as to provide for an extension of the channel 4 feet deep at mean low water and 60 feet bottom width, for a distance of about 2,265 feet, to a suitable landing in the vicinity of the lower oyster canning factory, at an estimated cost of \$10,000 and \$1,000 annually for maintenance, provided, however, that local interests shall contribute \$5,000 to the cost of the work and shall also provide a public wharf which in the opinion of the Secretary of War will be suitable for the accommodation of the boats running to McClellanville. The amount estimated for Government expenditure on first construction, \$5,000, should be made available in one appropriation.

9. In compliance with law, the board reports that except as contemplated by the above recommendations, there are no questions of terminal facilities, waterpower, or other subjects so related to the project proposed that they may be coordinated therewith to lessen the cost and compensate the Government for expenditures made in the interests of navigation.

For the board:

FREDERIC V. ABBOT,  
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,  
Senior Member Present.

---

#### PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION OF JEREMY CREEK, S. C.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,  
Charleston, S. C., April 16, 1913.

From: The District Engineer Officer.

To: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army  
(Through Division Engineer).

Subject: Preliminary examination of Jeremy Creek, S. C.

1. The river and harbor act of March 4, 1913, called for a preliminary examination of the following locality: Jeremy Creek, S. C. from Morrisons Wharf to Morrisons Bridge, with a view to providing a depth of 4 feet and a width of 60 feet.

The following is the report of the examination:

2. In improving the inland waterway on the coast of South Carolina, the United States has completed a channel 4 feet deep at low water and 60 feet bottom width from Charleston in a northeasterly direction to McClellanville, a village in the northern end of Charleston County, the distance between Charleston and McClellanville measured along the inland waterway route being 43 miles. The



oute ends at Morrisons Landing, in McClellanville. That portion of the waterway lying along the water front of McClellanville is known as Jeremy Creek, a shallow salt-water stream. It extends about 1 mile above Morrisons Landing to Morrisons Bridge, where it is lost in the salt marsh. Improvement is desired over this stretch of 1 mile.

3. McClellanville is a village of a few hundred inhabitants who are mostly engaged in agricultural pursuits. Merchandise for the stores and general produce are conveyed to and from Charleston in gasoline launches that use Morrisons Landing. Above this landing and within the limits of the village, are two oyster canning factories and still farther up the creek, below Morrisons Bridge, is the terminus of a ramroad, where lumber is loaded in barges and logs are made up into rafts. Within the village, but not on the banks of the creek, are a cotton gin and a sawmill. As Jeremy Creek, above Morrisons Landing, is practically dry at low water boats have to wait on the tide, which has a height of 4.5 feet.

4. The improvement is desired by the two canning factories and the shipper of logs and lumber. The two factories ship about 30,000 cases of oysters per season, which, at \$1.25 per case, amounts to \$37,500. They also have about 150,000 bushels of oyster shells to dispose of, which placed on board scows at 1 cent per bushel has a value of \$1,500. The cases of oysters are hauled from the factories to Morrisons Landing and shipped. There would be a saving of \$100 per season if they could be shipped direct. The oyster sloops bringing in the oysters in the shell have to wait for the tide—the tide may be short, the sloops run aground, causing a shutdown of the factory and resultant loss. It is estimated that the output could be doubled if the creek were deepened.

5. Mr. A. S. McClellan, of McClellanville, who ships the logs and lumber, reports that in 1912 he shipped to Charleston 868,640 feet, which at an average price of \$12 per thousand, is worth over \$10,000. He states that if the creek were deepened, the unloading facilities could be increased 50 per cent, so that 1,300,000 feet could be handled, and that the cost of getting it to Charleston would be reduced at least \$2 per thousand. There would thus result a yearly saving of \$2,600. He also states that Jeremy Creek is the natural outlet for about 8,000,000 feet of pine and about 2,000,000 feet of hardwood; and that a far greater benefit would be the draining of a vast flat country which would take the water off the main road to Charleston, the only outlet by land. Another citizen of McClellanville estimates the timber contiguous to Jeremy Creek as at least 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 feet.

6. The owners of the lots along the creek would also be benefited as the material to be removed could be placed behind bulkheads, adding to the value of the lots. There has been, however, no offer of cooperation with the Government by the owners of the lots.

7. It appears therefore that the deepening of Jeremy Creek would be a great benefit to the parties living along the bank, to the timber interests and to the community at large, as the resultant savings would more than compensate for the expense; but there seems to be no reason why the United States should do the work. The dredged channel now extends to Morrisons Landing, where a wharf has been built, open to all comers upon a small monthly payment; there are



also other wharf sites below this where similar wharves could be established and these would take care of all the general business of the community. To extend the channel up Jeremy Creek would involve solid dredging for a mile, and about the only benefit the general community would receive would be the better drainage. The timber could easily be handled by extending the tramroad a mile down to the present dredged channel. There has been no offer of cooperation by the local interests to bear a part of the expense in the interests of drainage. The resulting benefits to general navigation will not be commensurate with the cost of improvement, and the improvement is therefore not recommended.

8. There are no questions of water power or other similar subjects involved in this improvement.

Respectfully submitted.

G. P. HOWELL,  
*Major, Corps of Engineers.*

[First indorsement.]

OFFICE OF DIVISION ENGINEER, SOUTHEAST DIVISION,  
*April 18, 1913.*

To the CHIEF OF ENGINEERS:

I agree with the district officer that Jeremy Creek, S. C., is not worthy of improvement by the United States at this time.

DAN C. KINGMAN,  
*Colonel, Corps of Engineers.*

[Third indorsement.]

BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS,  
*July 1, 1913.*

To the CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY:

At a hearing in the office of the board on this date, which was attended by Hon. B. R. Tillman, United States Senator, and Hon. R. S. Whaley, Member of Congress, and a delegation from the locality, it developed that the landing facilities at McClellanville are overtaxed by the existing commerce and that the practicability of securing additional landing places in firm land along the present channel is remote. It also appeared that some local cooperation might be secured. In order to fully determine the merits of the case, the board recommends that the district officer be authorized to make such survey as is necessary to determine the cost of improvement, and in connection therewith that he investigate fully the question of local cooperation.

For the board:

W. M. BLACK,  
*Colonel, Corps of Engineers,*  
*Senior Member of the Board.*



## SURVEY OF JEREMY CREEK, S C.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,  
*Charleston, S. C., December 4, 1913.*

From: The District Engineer Officer.

To: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Subject: Survey of Jeremy Creek, S. C.

1. As directed by the Chief of Engineers United States Army, in letter of July 7, 1913 a survey of Jeremy Creek has been made by this office, and the following report is submitted:

2. The survey began at Morrisons Wharf in McClellanville, the terminus of the present 4-foot channel connecting with the inland waterway to Charleston, S. C., and extended to Morrisons Bridge, a distance of 5,115 feet. The route, as shown in broken lines on the accompanying sketch, follows the bed of the creek, except in one instance, where it cuts across a point of marsh in order to reach the lower oyster-canning factory. The depth is 4 feet at mean low water and the bottom width 60 feet, with side slopes of 1 on 3. In front of the upper canning factory the width is increased to 100 feet, and at the upper end of the creek, just below the bridge, a basin has been provided for, 360 feet long and 125 feet wide. To form such a channel from Morrisons Landing to Morrisons Bridge will require the removal of 125,000 cubic yards of material. As the upper end is obstructed by trees and stumps, the cost would be at least \$25,000, with \$1,500 yearly for maintenance.

3. To investigate further into the merits of the case, and especially to ascertain what local cooperation could be secured, a public hearing was held November 24, 1913, at McClellanville under the auspices of the McClellanville Board of Trade. From the statements made at the hearing it appears that there is at present only one wharf for boats; that it is impracticable to obtain a site on the existing 4-foot channel below that wharf, and that consequently this channel must be extended; that adjacent to the upper canning factory a site with a frontage of 70 feet has been offered for a public wharf; that the tramroad for logs and lumber can not be extended to deep water owing to the impossibility of obtaining a right of way on either side of the creek; and that a landing place should be provided at the upper end of the creek for the sake of the farmers in the back country, as it would save the extra haul to a landing in the village, an important matter when vegetables are being transported. It was also pointed out that the railroad shortly to be constructed connecting Georgetown and Charleston will pass within 20 miles of McClellanville, and that it was highly probable that a branch would be extended to Jeremy Creek, necessitating additional terminal facilities. The engineer of the sanitary and drainage commission for Charleston County was present and stated that the county was spending at least \$5,000 in road building in that section, and that it was proposed to continue this work on the projects for road building and for drainage had been committed; that such work would give a decided impetus to farming operations and would increase the amount of farm products to be hauled over the improved roads to McClellanville, the point of shipment.



4. For a distance of about 1,500 feet below Morrisons Wharf there are good sites for wharves; but this frontage belongs to private parties who are unwilling to have wharves established there, as they desire to keep this portion of the village for residential purposes. McClellanville is not an incorporated town or village and there is no way to force these people to grant a wharf site. When a branch of the inland waterway was extended to McClellanville by the river and harbor act of March 2, 1907, the terminus was named as Morrison Landing. This was satisfactory to all parties at that time; as the entire business of the community was done by two boats; but the completion of the 4-foot channel has increased business to such an extent that an additional landing place is necessary. Such a place is found at the lower canning factory, 2,265 feet above Morrison Wharf; a channel to this point would cost about \$10,000. To extend the channel to the upper factory, a distance of 3,175 feet above Morrisons Wharf, where a site has been offered for a public wharf would cost about \$15,000.

5. At the hearing, the president of the board of trade stated that subscriptions to the amount of \$805 had been made by the citizens for the deepening of the creek as far as the tramroad. This subscription and the offer of the public wharf measure the amount of local cooperation that can be secured.

6. I do not believe that it is necessary for the general good of the community to deepen Jeremy Creek as far as the tramroad at Morrisons Bridge. The owners of the tramroad should themselves extend it to deep water. Should a railroad ever be built to McClellanville the question of providing additional terminal facilities can then be taken up. Nor do I think it is necessary for the farmers in the back country to have a landing at this point; the improved roads lead to the possible landing sites farther down the creek and the additional haul thereto is a small matter. Consequently, I report that the deepening of Jeremy Creek as far as Morrisons Bridge at a cost of \$25,000, with \$1,500 yearly for maintenance, is not advisable at the present time.

7. However, I believe that additional landing facilities should be provided for the McClellanville boats, and since it does not seem feasible for this rural community to establish such places along the channel already dug, I am in favor of extending the channel. It is not necessary at present to carry this extension farther than the lower canning factory. A better site for public wharf can be found here than at the upper factory, and as the two factories have recently been united into one, no hardship will result to the oyster interest. The cost of such extension, the channel being 4 feet deep and 60 feet wide, with suitable turning basin, will be:

Dredging 50,000 cubic yards, at 18 cents.....	\$9,000
Contingencies.....	1,000
	<hr/> 10,000

The maintenance is estimated at \$1,000 per year. If this work is authorized by Congress, the entire amount should be appropriated in one sum.

8. The subscription of \$805 was made contingent on the extension of the channel to the tramroad. If the channel is not carried to that point, the subscription will not be available. With respect



the public wharf, it is recommended that no work on the new channel be done until a site for a public wharf has been donated and a suitable wharf actually built thereon, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, is of sufficient size to accommodate the boats running to McClellanville.

9. The work herein recommended should not be regarded as a new work, but rather as another modification of the project for the inland waterways between Charleston Harbor, S. C., and Alligator Creek opposite McClellanville. The first modification was to provide for a branch of the channel to Morrisons Landing; the second modification to provide for extending the branch to the lower canning factory. Respectfully submitted.

G. P. HOWELL,  
*Major, Corps of Engineers.*

[For report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on survey, see p. 3.]













